

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/087,355	03/01/2002	Richard C. Boucher JR.	5470.250DV	3423
20792 75	90 03/17/2005 .		EXAMINER	
MYERS BIGEL SIBLEY & SAJOVEC			WANG, SHENGJUN	
PO BOX 37428				
RALEIGH, NC 27627			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/087,355	BOUCHER, RICHARD C.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Shengjun Wang	1617			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)🖾	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 November 2004.					
· · _	<u> </u>	s action is non-final.				
3)□	· 1					
Disposition of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	 4) Claim(s) 14,15,20,31-39,41-43 and 50-56 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 14,15,20,31-39,41-43 and 50-56 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Applicati	on Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
2) Notice	t(s) se of References Cited (PTO-892) se of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 or No(s)/Mail Date 11/12/04,11/18/04.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	(PTO-413) ate ratent Application (PTO-152)			

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/087,355

Art Unit: 1617

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on November 12, 2004 has been entered.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 14, 15, 20, 31-44 and 50-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheele (U.S. Patent 5,863,563, of record) in view of Cropp and Glass (U.S. Patent 5,162,348, of record).
- 3. Scheele teaches a method for treating symptom of a patient who has pulmonary conditions, including cystic fibrosis, the method comprising causing the patient inhale a composition comprising alkali metal salts, such as potassium salt or sodium salts. Various anions may be employed, including bicarbonate. See, column 5, line 52 bridging column 6, line 18, and the claims.
- 4. Scheele does not teach expressly the employment of combination of salts, or the further employment of bronchodilator in the composition.

Application/Control Number: 10/087,355

Art Unit: 1617

5. However, Cropp and Glass teach that bronchodilators are well known to be useful for treating cystic fibrosis, particularly administered in aerosolized forms. The well-known bronchodilators include isoproterenol, metaproterenol. See, particularly, the abstract, table IV in Cropp and column 1, lines 44-51 in Glass. Glass further suggests that bronchodilators may be employed with other agents useful for treating cystic fibrosis.

Therefore, it would have been prima facie obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the claimed the invention was made, to employ more than one of the known salts disclosed by Scheele in the therapeutical composition, or treating the patient with well-known bronchodilator before administering the instant composition.

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ more than one of the known salts disclosed by Scheele in the therapeutical composition, or treating the patient with bronchodilator before administering the instant composition because all the salts disclosed by Scheele are known to be similarly useful in treating cystic fibrosis and it is prima facie obvious to combine two compositions each of which is taught in the prior art to be useful for same purpose in order to form third composition that is to be used for very the same purpose; idea of combining them flows logically from their having been individually taught in prior art; See In re Kerkhoven, 205 USPQ 1069. The combining treatment with bronchodilator is also obvious since bronchodilator is known to be useful for treating cystic fibrosis. The optimization of a result effective parameter, e.g., the method of administering two agents, is considered within the skill of the artisan. See, In re Boesch and Slaney (CCPA) 204 USPQ 215. The examiner assumes that claim 37, as amended, would still read on the elected potassium bicarbonate, absent an indication to the contrary.

Application/Control Number: 10/087,355

Art Unit: 1617

6. Claims 14, 15, 20, 31-44 and 50-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheele (U.S. Patent 5,863,563, of record) in view of Cropp and Glass (U.S. Patent 5,162,348, of record), in further view of Robinson et al. (IDS)

7. The claims are obvious over Scheele, Cropp and Glass for reasons discussed above. Robinson et al. provide further motivation to combine the cited references thereby reach the claimed invention. Robinson et al. teach that applying hypertonic solution to lung surface are beneficial to improve the lung function of cystic fibrosis patients and further suggest its combination with bronchodilator. 1507 to 1408, particularly, the last two paragraphs at page 1508. One of ordinary skill in the art, would have been further motivated to combine a hypertonic solution, such as those disclosed by Scheele with a bronchodilator for treatment of cystic fibrosis patients because of the benefit suggested by Robinson et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shengjun Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-0632. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sreeni Padmanabhan, can be reached on (571) 272-0629. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent
Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications
may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished
applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

Application/Control Number: 10/087,355

Art Unit: 1617

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SHENGJUN WANG
PShengy EXAMINER
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1617

Page 5